

Feature-rich Geometric and Electronic Properties of Carbon Nanoscrolls

S. L. Chang,^a C. R. Chiang,^b S. Y. Lin,^{b*}

Received Xth XXXXXXXXXXXX 20XX, Accepted Xth XXXXXXXXXXXX 20XX

First published on the web Xth XXXXXXXXXXXX 200X

DOI: 10.1039/b000000x

The physical properties of carbon nanoscroll (CNS) were studied by using the first principles methods within the generalized gradient approximation. Two different kinds of chiral (armchair and zigzag) CNSs are considered and their properties were compared. Bond lengths, ground state energies, band structures, and band gaps are discussed. The CNS can be regarded as a rolled up single layer graphene. The atoms at the edge are saturated by hydrogen atoms and the C-C bond length near the edge is smaller. The minimum diameters of the armchair and zigzag CNSs are 5.54 Å and 6.95 Å, respectively. The total ground state energy is strongly dependent on the width. And the energy difference induced by this width dependence is mainly contributed by the van der Waals and the strain energy. Armchair CNSs are metallic or semiconductor depending on their widths. Zigzag CNSs with an anti ferromagnetic arrangement belong to semiconductors. And the energy gap is decreased by the width increment.

1 INTRODUCTION

Condensed-matter systems purely made up of carbon atoms comprise diamond,^{1,2} few-layer graphenes,^{3–5} carbon nanotubes,^{6–8} graphene nanoribbons,^{9–12} nanoscroll^{13–16} and C60-related fullerenes.^{17–19} These systems exhibit very rich physical, chemical, and material properties, mainly owing to their special structural symmetries and varying dimensionality. Recently, one-dimensional carbon nanoscrolls (1D CNSs) have attracted much attention for its special geometric structure and electronic properties.^{13,14,17,18,20–26} Each CNS can be regarded as a spirally wrapped 2D graphene sheet with a 1D scroll structure. Unlike a carbon nanotube, which is a closed cylinder, a CNS is open at two edges. Clearly, CNSs possess flexible interlayer spaces to intercalate or to be susceptible to doping, indicating the high application potentials in hydrogen storages,^{23,24,27,28} Li-batteries,^{25,29,30} and mechanical devices.^{25,26} However, about nanoscroll structures, the question remains whether they are perfectly spiral or not. The previous studies^{31,32} on carbon nanotubes show that the non-cylindrical structures are more prone to exist in the large diameter cases due to the layer-layer interactions. Such effects are expected to play an important role in plastic CNSs. In this paper, we investigate the geometric and electronic properties of non-ideal

CNSs, and these predicted results are innovative and interesting.

CNSs have been successfully produced by the different physical and chemical methods,^{13,14,17,18,20,21} including arc-discharge,¹⁷ high-energy ball milling of graphite,²⁰ and chemical route. However, the theoretical researches are rare and only focus on the ideal CNSs. Their electronic properties are predicted to be similar to those of the flat graphene nanoribbons, depending on edge structures and ribbon widths. In addition to the edge and quantum-confined effects,³³ the non-ideal CNSs are significantly affected by the curvature and stacking effects in terms of the structure stability and the electronic properties. In the past, many studies about the curved ribbons^{34–37} and few-layer graphene^{38–41} have shown that the geometric structure is the key factor for the change of physical properties. The curved surface forces the parallel $2p_z$ orbitals to become unparallel, which in turn leads to the hybridizations of carbon four orbitals.^{36,42,43} Different stackings will have an impact on the layer-layer interactions and the free charge carriers.^{38,44,45} These hybrid features in CNSs enable the possession of versatile and enhanced properties that are more adaptable in the future electronic applications.

In this paper, the geometric and electronic properties of non-ideal carbon nanoscrolls are detailedly investigated by the first-principles calculations. Two types of CNSs, various ribbon widths, and spin arrangements are considered. The essential properties, including the optimal geometric, formation energy, charge density, band structure, energy gap, and density of states, are determined by the completion and cooperation between the curvature and stacking effects. They possess basic properties similar to that of the flat nanoribbon, such as, the

^{0a} Department of Electrophysics, National Chiao Tung University, Hsinchu 300, Taiwan.

^{0b} Department of Physics, National Cheng Kung University, 701 Tainan, Taiwan.

* E-mail: sylin.1985@gmail.com

zigzag systems being magnetic materials, three types of the energy gaps classified in the armchair system, and the decreasing energy gaps resulting from the increased ribbon width. However, the hybrid structure accounts for the distinct properties. For instance, the zigzag systems possess the special electronic properties associated with the spin arrangements; the rule governing the size order of the energy gap is changed in the armchair system; and disregarding their system types, they all have smaller energy gaps compared with the flat nanoribbon. The predicted results could be verified by the experimental measurements. And these enriched electronic properties let the CNS have a potential suitability not only in energy storages and machine components but also in the electronic and spintronic devices.

2 COMPUTATIONAL DETAILS

The geometric and electronic structures of CNSs are studied by the Vienna ab initio simulation package^{46,47} in the density-functional theory (DFT). The DFT-D2 method⁴⁸ is taken into account in order to describe the weak van der Waals interactions. The projector augmented wave method is utilized to characterize the electron-ion interactions. The exchange-correlation energy of the electron-electron interactions is evaluated within the local-density approximation. The wave functions are expanded by plane waves with the maximum kinetic energy limited to 500 eV. The k-point sampling is outlined by the Monkhorst-Pack scheme.⁴⁹ The $12 \times 1 \times 1$ and $300 \times 1 \times 1$ k-grids in the first Brillouin zone are, respectively, the settings used for the geometry optimization and band-structure calculations. The Hellmann-Feynman net force on each atom is smaller than $0.03 \text{ eV/\AA}$. In order to avoid interactions between the scrolled graphene superlattices of the adjacent unit cells, different vacuum spacings in the z-direction (or the y-direction) are tested and a value of $15 \text{ \AA}$ is best for the accurate and efficient calculations.

3 Results and discussion

3.1 Geometric properties and formation energy

A CNS could be regarded as a rolled-up graphene sheet in the vector direction $R = m\mathbf{a}_1 + n\mathbf{a}_2$, or the (m, n) notation, where $\mathbf{a}_1$ and $\mathbf{a}_2$ are the basic vectors of a graphene sheet. Two open edges are saturated by the hydrogens atoms (green color balls). Two typical longitudinal structures, armchair (m, m) and zigzag $(m, 0)$ CNSs, are chosen for a model study, since they exhibit the unique geometric and electronic properties. Moreover, the optimal structures of CNSs are dependent on the initial conditions including ribbon widths and internal lengths (or inner radii). The initial structures are kept at a perfect arch shape,

as shown in Figs. 1(a) and 2(b). The ribbon width (N_y) is characterized by the number of dimer or zigzag lines along the transverse, and the internal length (N_{in}) only counts the dimer or zigzag lines in the inner radius (red balls). Armchair and zigzag CNSs, with their geometric characteristics, are defined by $(N_y, N_y; N_{in})$ and $(N_y, 0; N_{in})$, respectively.




Figure 1 For armchair carbon nanoscrolls, the ideal structure of (a) $(34, 34; 7)$ and the optimal structures of (b) $(34, 34; 7)$, (c) $(43, 43; 9)$; (d) $(47, 47; 11)$.

Before the self-consistent constraint is imposed, the curvature of the CNS is kept at a perfect arch shape that is shown in Figs. 1(a) and 2(a), whereas the relaxed optimal structure becomes less regular, as displayed in Figs. 1(b) and 2(b). The CNS has to be wide enough to keep its shape. The scroll geometry is sustained by the layer-layer interactions and simultaneously counterbalanced by strain forces. The reduced overlapping region caused by the insufficient width will hinder the formation of the scroll. The critical length strongly depends on the inner length. Disregarding the periodic edge shape, all the interlayer distances are between $3.22 \text{ \AA}$ and $3.35 \text{ \AA}$, and




Figure 2 For zigzag carbon nanoscrolls, the ideal structure of (a) (18,0;4) and the optimal structures of (b) (18,0;4), (c) (34,0;6).

the average distance is about 3.34 Å. A deeper understanding shows that all the interlayer configurations in CNSs are similar to those of the AB-layered carbon systems, owing to the higher cohesive energy presented in the AB stacking.^{6,7} Perceivably, a CNS can be qualified as a stable structure, being determined by the sufficiently large width and overlapping length.

The formation of CNS is mainly dominated by two critical structure parameters: the inner length and the scroll width, as shown in Fig. 3. To hold the structure as a scroll, the required formation energy, defined as the energy difference between the total energy of a CNS and that of a flat GNR, is formulated as $E_{for} = E_{int} + E_{cur}$. E_{int} is the energy originating from the interlayer atomic interactions in the overlapping region; meanwhile, E_{cur} is that related to the restoration force caused by the mechanic strain. Given that $E_{for} > 0$, it is obvious that the strain energy is larger than the interlayer interactions. In searching the minimum armchair systems, the critical width is found to be associated with the (34,34;7) CNS, corresponding to the crit-

ical inner length of $N_{in} = 7$. As the width becomes larger, the corresponding increase of the overlapping region is responsible for pushing E_{int} negatively, and E_{cur} plunges due to its inverse proportionality to the square of the enlarged effective diameter. Therefore, E_{for} decreases in the increase of width as shown in Fig. 3(a). Within the width range of $m = 34 \sim 36$ (the solid-line dots), the interlayer distances are relatively large near the end of the overlapping region, leading to the weaker interlayer interactions and thus a smaller and smoother variation in the formation energy. As for $m = 37 \sim 40$ (the dashed-line dots), a more stable AB stacking is reached in the process that the carbon atoms close to the open end start to move towards the adjacent layer; therefore, the formation energy decreases more dramatically. As the width extends to the ranges $m = 41 \sim 46$ and $m = 47 \sim 52$, they all begin with a slow change but then evolve into a fast decrease in terms of the energy variation, shaping the downward curve into away form. When the critical inner length grows, it is necessary to have a wider critical width. $N_{in} = 9$ and 11 correspond to the minimum widths $m = 43$ and 47. To counter the decreased overlapping region owing to the inner length extension, the wider critical width can reduce the mechanic strain and thus compensate for the loss of the interlayer interactions in forming the nanoscroll structure. In considering different inner lengths, it is concluded that all E_{for} 's have a similar dependence on widths and a longer inner length corresponds to a lower energy. These findings support the fact that a larger inner diameter results in a smaller E_{cur} as discussed previously.

The zigzag CNS's are similar to the armchair ones in the width dependence of formation energy. More specifically, when the minimum inner length is $N_{in} = 4$, the smallest zigzag CNS is (18,0;4). The width-dependent formation energy is shown in Fig. 4(b) that similarly displays the wave-like dependence with the downward trend as what the armchair system has presented, signifying that both systems share a common process during the geometric variation. $N_{in} = 6, 8$ and 10 correspond to the critical widths $m = 20, 22$ and 23, respectively. With respect to the minimum-width system, the inner diameter is smaller in the armchair type than in the zigzag type, meaning that the former can sustain the larger restoration force caused by the mechanic strain. Therefore, the armchair CNSs are more easily to be formed and become more stable than those of the zigzag type.

3.2 Electronic properties

The electronic properties of CNSs are deeply affected by edge shapes, widths, curvatures, and spin arrangements. An armchair (38,38;7) CNS, as shown in Fig. 4(a), exhibits a lot of 1D parabolic energy dispersions, in which the occupied valence bands are not symmetric to the unoccupied conduction bands about the Fermi level ($E_F = 0$). The energy bands are all




Figure 3 Formation energy of the scroll widths for (a) Armchair CNS and (b) zigzag CNS with different inner lengths.

doubly degenerate for both spin states: spin-up and spin-down. Each energy dispersion has the local minimum or maximum at $k_x = 0$ and 1 and also at other wave vectors; that is to say, there are extra band-edge states except those at $k_x = 0$ and 1. In the vicinity of E_F , the highest occupied state and the lowest unoccupied occur at the same wave vector ($k_x=0.1$), which, thus, leads to a direct energy gap of $E_g=0.08$ eV. Contrarily, the armchair (39,39;7) CNS (Fig. 4(b)) possesses an indirect energy gap. Associated with this gap are the highest occupied and the lowest unoccupied states that appear, respectively, at $k_x = 0.01$ and 0.13, and they are separated by a gap size of $E_g = 0.027$ eV. These two energy bands are relatively smooth near $k_x=0$ without obvious dispersions, representing the $3N$ -width characteristics. Both the armchair (40,40;7) CNS with $(3N+1)$ width (Fig. 4(c)) and the armchair (38,38;7) CNS with $(3N+2)$ width own direct energy gaps. The important differences between them are that the former has a smaller gap of $E_g = 0.023$ eV and the strongly non-monotonous energy dis-

persions. In addition, energy spacing of the $k_x = 0$ state between two energy bands nearest to $E_F = 0$ is higher than energy gap. Apparently, there are certain important differences among the $3N$ -, $(3N+1)$ - and $(3N+2)$ -width systems. On the other hand, the CNSs are in sharp contrast to the flat GNRs (Fig. 4(d)). The latter possess a pair of monotonous parabolic energy dispersions nearest to $E_F = 0$, in which their $k_x = 0$ states determine a direct energy gap. Moreover, their energy gaps are much larger than those of the former, e.g., energy gaps of the $m = 38$ systems.




Figure 4 Band structures of armchair system for (a) (38,38;7), (b) (39,39;7), (c) (40,40;7); (d) flat GNR with $m=38$, and zigzag system for (e) (36,0;4); (f) flat GNR with $m=36$.

Electronic structures of zigzag CNSs are enriched by the anti-ferromagnetic spin configuration at two edges, as shown in Fig. 4(e) for the (36,0;4) CNS. Most of energy are doubly degenerate, while there exist the spin-up and spin-down splitting bands near $E_F=0$. This could be clearly understood from the spin-up and spin-down charge distributions in Fig. 5 (red and blue colors), since for the distinct spin states, the H-

passivated carbon atoms at each end of the open structure to interact different with the surrounding atoms. The four splitting bands have the weak energy dispersions, in which they are mainly contributed by the local edge atoms. Such bands will determine two kinds of spin-dependent energy gaps. The energy gaps belonging to the direct type appear approximately at $k_x = 2/3$. Noticeably, the spin-up gap, 0.18 eV, is smaller than the spin-down gap, 0.23 eV. In comparison, the flat GNR has its four flat bands degenerate into two bands (Fig. 4(f)), since the same end-structure environment in flat GNRs results in no difference for the edge effects from two ends. Again, the energy gap at $k_x = 2/3$ is a direct one with its size being at 0.14 eV.




Figure 5 The charge distribution of spin-up and spin-down states, indicated by red and blue regions, respectively.

3.3 Charge distributions

The charge distribution on CNSs, which is very useful in understanding the hybridizations of orbitals (or the orbital bondings) and the low-lying energy bands, are significantly affected by the curved surface.^{43,50} The variation of charge distribution created by subtracting the carrier density of an isolated carbon (a hollow circle) from that of a CNS is clearly illustrated in Figs. 6(a) and 6(b). As for the planar region of the armchair (38,38;7) CNS, resembling a flat GNR as enclosed by the rectangle in Fig. 6(a), the $2s$, $2p_x$, and $2p_y$ orbitals of one carbon atom interact with those of the nearby carbon atoms to form the σ bonds ((I) in orange shades). The charge densities are concentrated to the bond locations in the middle of the two binding atoms and much lowered for the rest parts of the carbon atoms to create the depletion zones as indicated by the blue shades. Moreover, the $2p_z$ orbitals ((II) in orange shades) perpendicular to the plane can interact with its nearest neighbors to form the π bonds. Induced by the curvature effect, there are two main causes that can contribute to the orbital hybridization. One is that the non-parallel $2p_z$ orbitals can lead to the σ bonds in addition to the π bonds. Another is the hybridization of four orbitals that is also responsible for introducing the complex π and σ bonds. Associated with these bond formations are the serious hybridizations that take place on the internal side of the curved surface as shown in (III) and (IV). The direct impact from these hybridizations is reflected in the significant variation of the low-lying band structure, including the non-monotonic energy dispersions associated with the strongly hybridized atomic orbitals and the energy gap due to the $k_x \neq 0$ state (Figs. 4(a)-4(c)). The aforementioned changes on the band structure are in good agreement with the previous studies on the carbon nanotube and curved GNR. A further deduction from the curvature effect is that the dumbbell shape of $2p_z$ orbitals makes the charge distribution thicker on the nanoscroll surface towards outside but thinner on surface towards inside. These larger $2p_z$ orbitals on the outer surface provide an ideal environments to bond with H, Li and other atoms, showing the possibilities in energy storage and electronic nano-device.

The zigzag CNS (Fig. 6(b)) and the armchair CNS partially share the similar charge distribution. In the planar region, they both have their π bonds created by the $2p_z$ orbitals ((II)) and their σ bonds formed from the $2s$, $2p_x$, and $2p_y$ orbitals((I)). Unlike the armchair configuration, the orbital hybridization in the curved regions (III and IV) appears to be weaker due to the longer distance between carbon atoms. As we move to the outer portion of the nanoscroll, the decreased curvature can dwindle the hybridization to a trivial level. That is to say, the very weak hybridization is presented at the outer section. Speaking of the different features of energy bands in the zigzag CNS, the energy bands near E_F are mainly contributed by the carbon atoms at the two open edges. Given that spin-up and spin-down states




Figure 6 The charge distribution for (a) armchair (38,38;7) CNS; (b) zigzag (36,0;4) CNS. (II) are the 2pz orbitals and (I) are other three orbitals. (III) and (I) are the serious orbital hybridizations.

are ignored, the distributions of the charge density at these two edges almost remain unchanged. Therefore, the energy bands in the zigzag case are not much different from those presented in the flat GNR.

4 Concluding remarks

After the self-consistent field is solved, the stable structure is determined by the equilibrium between the ribbon width and the scroll surface. If the internal length or the layer-layer overlapping area is too small, the nanoscroll structure will not be sustainable. In consequence, the typical cross section of the ideal scroll becomes more oval. For armchair CNSs, the minimum (critical) internal length is $N_{in} = 7$. Given the internal length smaller than the critical length, the optimal structure will be restored back to the shape where the internal length is crit-

ical. With respect to each internal length, there exists a stable structure with the minimum ribbon width. Assuming that the ribbon width is less than the minimum value, the scroll structure will collapse to the flat graphene nanoribbon due to the insufficient layer-layer interactions. Such interaction will lead to the AA' stacking configuration which provides larger interaction forces, and the average interlayer distance is about 3.35 Å. For a group of CNSs with a small deviation about the curvature radius, all the formations will result in the same internal length in order to maintain the AA' stacking configuration. On the other hand, for the zigzag systems, the critical internal length is $N_{in} = 4$, and the optimal configuration is AB stacking with the average interlayer distance ~ 3.2 Å. Such stacking configuration is the same as that in the bilayer graphene and nanoribbon. As compared with armchair CNSs, zigzag CNSs possess larger curvature radiuses (inner lengths), and layer-layer interactions. Therefore, a narrower ribbon width is required to form zigzag CNSs.

The formation energy (ΔE), defined as the energy difference between the total energy of a CNS and that of a flat GNR, is mainly dominated by the bending energy and the interlayer interaction. The former is the restoration potential energy caused by the mechanical strain, while the latter originates from the layer-layer atomic interactions in the overlapping region. The competition between the bending energy and the interlayer interaction would determine the two critical structure parameters: the inner length and the ribbon width. Note that the ΔE 's are greater than zero, because the bending energy is always larger than the interlayer interaction. The ΔE depends on the ribbon width and inner length. For the armchair systems, three kinds of N_y -dependences of ΔE are shown in Fig. 3(a), and the ΔE 's increase with the ribbon width. The relationship is attributed to the increased layer-layer interactions with the larger overlapping areas, but the decreased bending energies with the larger curvature radius. And thus the critical ribbon widths of $N_{in} = 7, 9$, and 11 are, respectively, 34, 43, and 47. It is worth to notice that, in considering the smaller inner length and ribbon width, the energy dependence on the width is not linear, but more like stairs. This is attributed to the fact that each carbon atom in the CNS is subjected to different force fields, such as the larger bending energy in the larger curvature part of the CNS, and the smaller bending energy in the flat part or the smaller curvature part of the structure. As for the zigzag system, it presents similarities to the armchair type regarding the energy dependence. However, there are some differences since they are not rolled in the same manner. The zigzag systems possess larger curvatures and stronger layer-layer interactions owing to the AB stacking configuration. As the width increases, the energy decays faster in the AB stacked zigzag system than in the AA stacked armchair system, so that the formation energy can easily and quickly reach the deeper negative levels. In all, the lower total energy makes CNS more stable than the flat nanoribbon, and

the critical ribbon widths of $N_{in} = 4$ and 9 are, respectively, 18 and 20.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Physics Division, National Center for Theoretical Sciences (South), the National Science Council of Taiwan (Grant No. NSC 102-2112-M-006-007-MY3). We also thank the National Center for High-performance Computing (NCHC) for computer facilities.

References

- [1] J. Robertson, *Materials Science and Engineering: R: Reports*, 2002, **37**, 129–281.
- [2] A. Grill, *Diamond and related materials*, 1999, **8**, 428–434.
- [3] D. Graf, F. Molitor, K. Ensslin, C. Stampfer, A. Jungen, C. Hierold and L. Wirtz, *Nano letters*, 2007, **7**, 238–242.
- [4] J. C. Meyer, A. K. Geim, M. I. Katsnelson, K. S. Novoselov, T. J. Booth and S. Roth, *Nature*, 2007, **446**, 60–63.
- [5] K. Gopinadhan, Y. J. Shin, R. Jalil, T. Venkatesan, A. K. Geim, A. H. C. Neto and H. Yang, *Nature communications*, 2015, **6**, year.
- [6] Z. Ren, Z. Huang, J. Xu, J. Wang, P. Bush, M. Siegal and P. Provencio, *Science*, 1998, **282**, 1105–1107.
- [7] J. W. Wilder, L. C. Venema, A. G. Rinzler, R. E. Smalley and C. Dekker, *Nature*, 1998, **391**, 59–62.
- [8] M. Liao, S. Jiang, C.-R. Hu, R. Zhang, Y.-M. Kuang, J.-Z. Zhu, Y. Zhang and Z. Dong, *Nano Letters*, 2016.
- [9] D. V. Kosynkin, A. L. Higginbotham, A. Sinitskii, J. R. Lomeda, A. Dimiev, B. K. Price and J. M. Tour, *Nature*, 2009, **458**, 872–876.
- [10] K. Kim, A. Sussman and A. Zettl, *ACS nano*, 2010, **4**, 1362–1366.
- [11] Y.-C. Chen, T. Cao, C. Chen, Z. Pedramrazi, D. Haberer, D. G. de Oteyza, F. R. Fischer, S. G. Louie and M. F. Crommie, *Nature nanotechnology*, 2015, **10**, 156–160.
- [12] H.-C. Chung, C.-P. Chang, C.-Y. Lin and M.-F. Lin, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 2016, **18**, 7573–7616.
- [13] L. M. Viculis, J. J. Mack and R. B. Kaner, *Science*, 2003, **299**, 1361–1361.
- [14] M. V. Savoskin, V. N. Mochalin, A. P. Yaroshenko, N. I. Lazareva, T. E. Konstantinova, I. V. Barsukov and I. G. Prokofiev, *Carbon*, 2007, **45**, 2797–2800.
- [15] X. Shi, N. M. Pugno and H. Gao, *Journal of Computational and Theoretical Nanoscience*, 2010, **7**, 517–521.
- [16] T. D. Daff, S. P. Collins, H. Dureckova, E. Perim, M. S. Skaf, D. S. Galvão and T. K. Woo, *Carbon*, 2016, **101**, 218–225.
- [17] R. Bacon, *Journal of Applied Physics*, 1960, **31**, 283–290.
- [18] X. Xie, L. Ju, X. Feng, Y. Sun, R. Zhou, K. Liu, S. Fan, Q. Li and K. Jiang, *Nano letters*, 2009, **9**, 2565–2570.
- [19] R. Panchuk, S. Prylutska, V. Chumak, N. Skorokhyd, L. Lehka, M. Evstigneev, Y. I. Prylutsky, W. Berger, P. Heffeter, P. Scharff *et al.*, *Journal of biomedical nanotechnology*, 2015, **11**, 1139–1152.
- [20] J. Li, L. Wang and W. Jiang, *Applied Physics A*, 2006, **83**, 385–388.
- [21] R. Haddon, A. Hebard, M. Rosseinsky, D. Murphy, S. Duclos, K. Lyons, B. Miller, J. Rosamilia, R. Fleming, A. Kortan *et al.*, *Nature*, 1991, **350**, 320–322.
- [22] H. W. Kroto, A. Allaf and S. Balm, *Chemical Reviews*, 1991, **91**, 1213–1235.
- [23] G. Mpourmpakis, E. Tylanakis and G. E. Froudakis, *Nano letters*, 2007, **7**, 1893–1897.
- [24] V. Coluci, S. Braga, R. Baughman and D. Galvao, *Physical Review B*, 2007, **75**, 125404.
- [25] J. Zhao, B. Yang, Z. Zheng, J. Yang, Z. Yang, P. Zhang, W. Ren and X. Yan, *ACS applied materials & interfaces*, 2014, **6**, 9890–9896.
- [26] X. Shi, N. M. Pugno, Y. Cheng and H. Gao, *Applied Physics Letters*, 2009, **95**, 163113.
- [27] S. Braga, V. Coluci, R. Baughman and D. Galvao, *Chemical physics letters*, 2007, **441**, 78–82.
- [28] Y. Huang and T. Li, *Journal of Applied Mechanics*, 2013, **80**, 040903.
- [29] M. Yan, F. Wang, C. Han, X. Ma, X. Xu, Q. An, L. Xu, C. Niu, Y. Zhao, X. Tian *et al.*, *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 2013, **135**, 18176–18182.
- [30] T. Tojo, K. Fujisawa, H. Muramatsu, T. Hayashi, Y. A. Kim, M. Endo, M. Terrones and M. S. Dresselhaus, *Rsc Advances*, 2013, **3**, 4161–4166.
- [31] V. Kresin and A. Aharony, *Nature*, 1995, **377**, 1673–1686.
- [32] D. Qian, G. J. Wagner, W. K. Liu, M.-F. Yu and R. S. Ruoff, *Applied mechanics reviews*, 2002, **55**, 495–533.
- [33] Y.-W. Son, M. L. Cohen and S. G. Louie, *Physical review letters*, 2006, **97**, 216803.
- [34] C. L. Kane and E. Mele, *Physical Review Letters*, 1997, **78**, 1932.
- [35] F. L. Shyu and M. F. Lin, *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan*, 2002, **71**, 1820–1823.
- [36] S.-L. Chang, B.-R. Wu, P.-H. Yang and M.-F. Lin, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 2012, **14**, 16409–16414.
- [37] S.-L. Chang, S.-Y. Lin, S.-K. Lin, C.-H. Lee and M.-F. Lin, *Scientific reports*, 2014, **4**, year.
- [38] E. Hwang, S. Adam and S. D. Sarma, *Physical review letters*, 2007, **98**, 186806.
- [39] Y. Lai, J. Ho, C. Chang and M.-F. Lin, *Physical Review B*, 2008, **77**, 085426.
- [40] S.-L. Chang, B.-R. Wu, J.-H. Wong and M.-F. Lin, *Carbon*, 2014, **77**, 1031–1039.
- [41] C.-Y. Lin, J.-Y. Wu, Y.-J. Ou, Y.-H. Chiu and M.-F. Lin, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 2015, **17**, 26008–26035.
- [42] J. Feng, L. Qi, J. Y. Huang and J. Li, *Physical Review B*, 2009, **80**, 165407.

- [43] S.-Y. Lin, S.-L. Chang, F.-L. Shyu, J.-M. Lu and M.-F. Lin, *Carbon*, 2015, **86**, 207–216.
- [44] Y.-W. Son, S.-M. Choi, Y. P. Hong, S. Woo and S.-H. Jhi, *Physical Review B*, 2011, **84**, 155410.
- [45] N. T. T. Tran, S.-Y. Lin, O. E. Glukhova and M.-F. Lin, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C*, 2015, **119**, 10623–10630.
- [46] G. Kresse and D. Joubert, *Physical Review B*, 1999, **59**, 1758.
- [47] G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, *Physical review B*, 1996, **54**, 11169.
- [48] S. Grimme, *Journal of computational chemistry*, 2006, **27**, 1787–1799.
- [49] J. P. Perdew, K. Burke and M. Ernzerhof, *Physical review letters*, 1996, **77**, 3865.
- [50] S.-Y. Lin, S.-L. Chang, N. T. T. Tran, P.-H. Yang and M.-F. Lin, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 2015, **17**, 26443–26450.